

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/631,921		TRIVEDI, JIGISH D.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Ron E Pompey		2812	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ron E Pompey. (3) _____.

(2) Michael Trenholm. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 April 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Okumura et al. (US 4,935,380).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)


THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicant does not need to sign

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Ron Pompey
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Trenholm discussed how the proposed claim amendment language, "...between the refractory material and the source layer such that electrical contact between the refractory material and the at least one conductive layer occurs through the source layer...", reads over Okumara. He pointed out that in figure 7E and in column 8, lines 5-8, an oxide is formed from and on the source layer and therefore would teach away from the present invention (including the newly proposed amendment), which teaches the interconnect being formed on the source layer to create a low resistance contact. Also that a general description was given in regards to the formation of the interconnect (column 8, lines 20-25), which implied that a via would be formed to the conductive layer and therefore the interconnect would be in direct contact with the conductive layer not the source layer. Whereas the newly proposed claim amendment requires the interconnect to be in direct contact with the source layer.



John F. Niebling
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800